

REMARKS

Claims 2-6, 8, 9, 11 and 12 stand rejected under § 101 as being directed toward nonstatutory subject matter. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, the examiner's comments are noted. However, server and server software are given different definition on page 2 of the present application at line 8. Thus, the rejection should not have defined the server as a piece of software. In addition, a piece of software is not accessible through the internet as required by claim 2 unless it is embodied on a machine. To avoid further delays in prosecution and discussion on the issue, the server in claims 2 and 3 has now been explicitly defined as being a server computer. That definition was already the only reasonable interpretation based upon the specification and the construction of the claim language itself. The scope of the claims is not changed, but the amendment is believed to address the examiner's interpretation in the § 101 rejection. Similar comments could have been made with respect to the host in claims 4-6 and the client in claims 8 and 9. In like manner, these claims are amended to include the definition that would have been given the claims in any event due to the language of the claims and the required interpretation in view of the specification.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, the rejection is also traversed. Claim 11 has been amended to be an independent claim, and claim 11 has been amended to also require permitting the access via client devices. This should address the rejection. Claim 12 has been amended to also specifically provide remote client devices, simulation of local phone services via a plurality of host computers. This addresses the comments made in the office action and places claim 12 within the class of statutory subject matter.

Claims 5-7 stand rejected under § 112 as being indefinite. The examiner's points have been noted, and the claims have been amended for clarity and to address the particular points raised in the office action. The rejection is believed moot in view of the amendments.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under § 102 as being anticipated by Wengrovitz. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claims are addressed generally in the office action by pointing to FIG. 3 of Wengrovitz and stating of the CTI server corresponds to the claimed server and the IP telephone corresponds to the claimed client. The claims are addressed as a group without reference to the individual features. The claims will be address individually as follows.

Respecting claim 1, claim 1 requires a host that provides access to a phone line through the internet. Claim 1 also requires a server that communicates with the host to provide client access to phone services. There is no corresponding host in Wengrovitz. Wengrovitz concerns a standard internet phone device. C. 2, LL. 65-67. Such a device uses a computer associated with the device to connect to a phone network via a conventional IP voice gateway. C. 4, LL. 20-21. In claim 1, a host is connected to a phone line and the server provides access to clients through the internet to that phone line. This permits a localization of phone services through a server in the internet. Thus, for example, by connection through the internet to a local phone line via the server, a client in the State of Washington can complete a call through a host computer in the State of Maine while incurring only the local phone charges associated with access related to the host computer in Maine. There is no

such host connected to a phone line in Wengrovitz to which access is provided for clients via the internet.

Regarding claim 2, in claim 2 a server computer provides access control to a remote client to access phone services through a host computer to provide the remote client with phone services available to the host computer. This creates a localized phone services via the internet provided by a server for clients. As discussed above, there is no host computer connected to a phone line in Wengrovitz and there is no server that controls access to the host computer.

Regarding claim 4, claim 4 is specifically directed to the host computer and has access to a local phone service. In claim 4, the host computer provides internet server enabled access to the local phone service via the internet connection by permitting a client to utilize the local phone service. Wengrovitz does not have any local host computer connected to a phone line. Wengrovitz is concerned with providing enhanced IP phone functionalities and expresses no concern whatsoever with providing localization phone services through the internet via server to a host computer connected to a local phone line. Wengrovitz uses standard IP voice gateways to connect to a PBX system.

In claims 8 and 9, a client device is configured to access a local phone service of a host computer (as amended) through an internet connection controlled by a server computer (as amended). As discussed above, this is a client device that can take advantage of localized services available through a host computer and access via a server. Wengrovitz does not provide localized phone services of the host computer via server and the internet to client devices.

Similarly, claim 10 provides a system for providing phone service to internet users through the internet. The host computers have access to local phone services and a server controls access between host computers and phone service clients. This provides clients with internet access to localized phone services of the host via the internet. Wengrovitz does not provide any comparable system as discussed above.

Claim 12 stands rejected under § 102 as being anticipated by Gallant. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 12 has been amended to require that the access be provided via a plurality of host computers. Upon review of Gallant, there is found no comparable business method to provide the localization of phone services to remote clients through the internet via a plurality of host computers connected to local phone services. The amendments are believed to address the rejection.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wengrovitz in view of Gallant. The rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 11 has been amended to require that clients be provided access to a system having one or more host computers where access is controlled by at least one server. As each host computer has access to a local phone service, this a localization of phone services to remote clients via a pay service. There is no corresponding host in Wengrovitz. Wengrovitz concerns a standard internet phone device. C. 2, LL. 65-67. Such a device uses a computer associated with the device to connect to a phone network via a conventional IP voice gateway. C. 4, LL. 20-21. Gallant suggest no modification to Wengrovitz to address this failure to teach or suggest feature of claim 11 not taught or suggested by Wengrovitz.

For all of the above reasons, reconsideration and allowance of the instant application is requested. Should the examiner have any questions or concerns that could be resolved by a telephone conference, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

/Steven P. Fallon/

By

Steven P. Fallon

Registration No. 35,132

November 4, 2009

300 South Wacker Drive, Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978